## **ENTERED**

March 26, 2020 David J. Bradley, Clerk

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

MICHAEL J. VEIT,	S	CIVIL ACTION NO.
Plaintiff,	S	4:18-cv-00576
	S	
	$\mathbb{S}$	
vs.	$\mathbb{S}$	JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE
	$\mathbb{S}$	
	$\mathbb{S}$	
LYONDELL	$\mathbb{S}$	
CHEMICAL COMPANY,	$\mathbb{S}$	
Defendant.	$\mathbb{S}$	

## ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is the Memorandum and Recommendation signed by the Magistrate Judge on February 25, 2020. Dkt 24. She there resolved the motion for summary judgment brought by Defendant Lyondell Chemical Company against the claims asserted by Plaintiff Michael Veit in this action. Dkt 15. In short, the Magistrate Judge granted the motion for summary judgment as to Veit's disability discrimination claim and denied it as to his age-discrimination claim.

Lyondell has filed timely objections. Dkt 25. It objects to the portion of the Magistrate Judge's memorandum that recommends denial of summary judgment on Veit's age-discrimination claim. Veit filed no response or objections of his own.

The Court conducts a *de novo* review of any of the Magistrate Judge's conclusions to which a party has specifically objected. See 28 USC § 636(b)(1)(C); *United States v Wilson*, 864 F2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir 1989). To accept the Memorandum and Recommendation as to any portions to which there is no objection, the Court need only satisfy itself that no clear error

appears on the face of the record. See *Guillory v PPG Industries Inc*, 434 F3d 303, 308 (5th Cir 2005), citing *Douglass v United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir 1996); see also FRCP 72(b) Advisory Comm Note (1983).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings, the record, the applicable law, and the objections. The Court has also reviewed *de novo* the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as to the age-discrimination claim.

The Court finds that the objections lack merit. The Court finds no other clear error in the Memorandum and Recommendation.

The Court OVERRULES the objections of Lyondell Chemical Company.

The Court ADOPTS the Memorandum and Recommendation as the Memorandum and Order of this Court.

The Court GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART the motion for summary judgment by Lyondell Chemical Company. Dkt 15. SO ORDERED.

Signed on March 26, 2020, at Houston, Texas.

Che Reshite The Hon. Charles Eskridge
United States District Judge